

August 20, 2003

Honorable Board of Supervisors  
County of Los Angeles  
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Room 383  
500 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012

**RE: NO CHANGE OF ZONE, DENIAL OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT  
PROJECT NO. 01-267-(5)  
PETITIONER: TOM SCHIFFILEA  
EAST SAN GABRIEL ZONED DISTRICT  
FIFTH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT (3-VOTE)**

Dear Supervisors:

The Regional Planning Commission, by its action of August 20, 2003, recommended **DENIAL** of the above described zone change case and **DENIED** the related conditional use permit case.

Pursuant to Section 22.16.200 of the County Code, the applicant or any other interested person may appeal the Regional Planning Commission's decision to the Board of Supervisors through the office of Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer, Room 383, Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012. The appeal must be postmarked or hand delivered in person within five (5) days after this recommendation is filed with your Board.

Respectfully Submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING  
James E. Hartl, AICP, Director of Planning

Frank Meneses, Acting Administrator  
Current Planning Division

Attachments: Commission Resolution, Findings, Staff Report  
C: Chief Administrative Officer  
County Counsel

FMS:RJF:KMS

August 20, 2003

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Christopher Sutton  
35 East Union Street, Suite C  
Pasadena, CA 91103-3945

RE: ZONE CHANGE/CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 01-267-(5)  
5144 Walnut Grove Avenue, San Gabriel

Dear Applicant:

The Regional Planning Commission, by its action of August 20, 2003, **DENIED** the above described zone change and conditional use permit cases.

The applicant or **ANY OTHER INTERESTED PERSON** may **APPEAL** the Regional Planning Commission's decision to the Board of Supervisors through the office of Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer, Room 383, Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. Contact the Executive Office for the necessary forms and the amount of the appeal fee at (213) 974-1426. The appeal must be postmarked or delivered in person within 15 days after this notice is received by the applicant.

If no appeal is made during this 15-day period, the Regional Planning Commission action is final. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact the Zoning Permits Section at (213) 974-6443.

Very truly yours,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING  
James E. Hartl, AICP  
Director of Planning

Russell J. Fricano, Ph.D., AICP  
Supervising Regional Planner  
Zoning Permits I Section

Enclosures: Findings

c: Board of Supervisors, Tom Schiffilea, Testifiers

RJF:KM

## **ZONE CHANGE/CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 01-267-(5)**

### **FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

**REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING DATE: MAY 14, 2003**

#### **SYNOPSIS:**

The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to develop a 2.19-acre parcel with a 31,284 square foot industrial building to be used for warehousing, light manufacturing and assembly. The property owner intends to occupy one-half of the building (15,642 square feet) of the space with his Atlas Van Lines moving and storage business; the other half of the building will be constructed as spec space for lease.

The applicant is concurrently requesting changes of zone from R-A/R-A-P (Residential – Agricultural/Residential – Agricultural, Parking) to M-1-DP (Light Manufacturing, Development Program) on the 2.19-acre subject property. The proposed DP designation requires the issuance of a conditional use permit for the proposed use.

#### **PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COMMISSION**

##### May 14, 2003 Public Hearing

A duly noticed public hearing was held before the Regional Planning Commission. All Commissioners were present. Three people were sworn in, the owner/applicant, the applicant's agent, and the applicant's real estate agent, and testified in favor of the request.

There was discussion regarding the type of businesses that would be located in the building, the possibility of developing a mixed-use project that would include residential to address the current housing shortage in the County, and the lack of available industrial land in the San Gabriel area.

There being no further testimony, the Commission voted (4-1) to close the public hearing, indicate its intent to deny the conditional use permit, and direct staff to prepare findings for denial.

#### Findings

1. The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to authorize the development of a 31,284 square foot industrial building with appurtenant parking and landscaping on 2.19 acres located at 5144 Walnut Grove Avenue, San

Gabriel, in the East San Gabriel Zoned District.

2. The subject property is comprised of five (5) assessors' parcels, parcel numbers 5388-038-039, 040, 041, 042, and 043. The subject property is flat and rectangular in shape. Access to the property is via two (2) driveways from Walnut Grove Avenue to the west.
3. Current zoning on the subject property is R-A (Residential - Agricultural, Residential – Agricultural, Parking). The majority of the five (5) parcels comprising the subject property are zoned R-A; assessor's parcel no. 5388-038-042 located on the east side of the subject property, and a portion of assessor's parcel no. 5388-038-043 located on the south side of the subject property are zoned R-A-P. The applicant is concurrently requesting changes of zone from R-A/R-A-P to M-1-DP (Light Manufacturing, Development Program). The proposed use is not permitted in the R-A or R-A-P zones, but it would be permitted in the proposed M-1-DP zone provided the use conforms to development plans approved as part of the rezoning and a conditional use permit is obtained with an approved development program in accordance with Section 22.40.030 of the County Code.
4. Surrounding zoning consists of R-A to the north, A-1 (Light Agricultural) to the east, R-1 (Single-Family Residential) to the west, and M-1 (Light Manufacturing) to the south.
5. The subject property is currently vacant. The northeastern portion of the property has been developed with a parking lot, low block walls separate the paved parking lot from the remainder of the undeveloped property.
6. The prevailing land use pattern in the surrounding area is single-family residential development. Surrounding land uses consist of:  
North: Five (5) single-family residences abut the project's north property line, and additional single-family residences are developed north of those. In addition, Roosevelt Elementary School is located approximately 500 feet north of the subject property.  
  
East: The previous owner of the subject property has retained an approximately 60-foot wide portion of the parcel (approved under Lot Line Adjustment 101,889) that is being used for truck parking associated with the light industrial building developed directly south of the subject property. On the east side of the parking lot a plant nursery has been developed, Southern California Edison transmitting lines run above the nursery. To the east of the nursery, within the unincorporated area of San Gabriel, single-family residences are developed.

South: The previous owner of the subject property has retained an approximately 40-foot wide portion of the parcel (approved under Lot Line Adjustment 101,699) that is being used for truck parking associated with the light industrial building developed directly south of the subject property. Union Pacific Railroad has a rail line running approximately 500-feet south of the subject property. On a site visit staff noted there is a large industrial building located south of the rail line that is currently vacant (the building is within the incorporated city of Rosemead).

West: Single-family residences are located west of the subject property.

7. A search for major projects pending in the area showed TR53623/OT01-187, located at 5553 Walnut Grove Avenue, San Gabriel, which is located approximately one-half mile north of the subject property. TR53623 is a request for eight (8) detached condominium units.
8. The subject property is located within the Low Density Residential land use classification on the Land Use Policy Map of the County General Plan. This classification depicts areas particularly suitable for single-family detached housing units, including large lot estates and typical suburban tract developments. Densities typically range from one to six units per gross acre. The intent of this classification is to maintain the character of existing low density residential neighborhoods and also to provide additional areas to accommodate future market demand. Further development or expansion of existing local commercial and industrial services is also permitted within the residential land use classifications. Local industrial uses are defined as light industrial uses of a minor nature, as defined by the scale of the facility, number of employees, service area, and general compatibility within the community setting. The proposed industrial use would include a 31,284 square foot building to be used for office space, warehousing and light manufacturing, serve a regional area, and could create noise, fumes, glare and traffic incompatible with the surrounding community, and it is therefore not consistent with the Low Density Residential land use classification.
9. The following goals and policies of the General Plan are applicable to the subject property and serve as guidelines for development within the Low Density Residential classification of the Land Use Policy Map.
  - a. Quality Neighborhoods
    - Goal: To maintain and enhance the quality of existing residential neighborhoods.
    - Policies: Encourage development of well designed twinhomes, townhouses and garden apartments, particularly on bypassed parcels within existing urban communities. (Policy No. D.3.)

Promote neighborhood commercial facilities that provide convenience

goods and services and complement community character through appropriate scale, design and locational controls. (Policy No. D.4.)

The proposal is not a residential project. The requested use, furniture moving, warehousing and storage, is not a neighborhood commercial facility providing convenience goods or services to the community.

b. Quality, Compatible Design

Goal: To encourage high quality design in all development projects, compatible with, and sensitive to, the natural and manmade environment.

Policies: Protect the character of residential neighborhoods by preventing the intrusion of incompatible uses that would cause environmental degradation such as excessive noise, noxious fumes, glare, shadowing and traffic. (Policy No. D.15.)

Promote planned industrial development in order to avoid land use conflicts with neighboring activities. (Policy No. D.16.)

The proposed light industrial use could cause excessive noise, fumes and traffic to the adjacent residential neighborhood. The proposed use could cause conflicts with the adjacent residences and school due to truck traffic from the truck trips generated to and from the site and noise associated with loading and unloading of goods.

10. The Commission finds that the proposed industrial use conflicts with the basic goals and policies of the General Plan.
11. There are no previous zoning cases noted on the subject property.
12. The applicant's site plan, marked Exhibit "A", depicts the 2.19 acre subject property developed with a one-story, 31,284 square foot industrial building. Two (2) 12'0" X 14'0" truck loading doors and one (1) truck loading space is shown on the south side of the building. The north side of the building depicts two (2) truck loading doors with two (2) truck loading spaces. 58 parking spaces (54 standard, 4 handicapped) are depicted, dispersed surrounding the building. Rolling gates to secure a portion of the parking lot are depicted on the south and east side of the building. A 20-foot wide landscaped berm is depicted on the north side of the property, six (6) and seven (7) foot landscaped strips are shown on the west side of the building (facing Walnut Grove Avenue), additional landscaping is dispersed throughout the parking lot. Access to the site is via two driveways from Walnut Grove Avenue to the west.
13. The applicant anticipates the hours of operation to be from 7:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. Monday through Saturday, with approximately 35 employees working in two (2) shifts.

14. The proposed industrial building is subject to the following development standards of the M-1 zone pursuant to Section 22.32.080 of the County Code:

- a. Any property used for the outside storage or display of raw materials, equipment or finished products shall comply with the requirements of Part 7 of Chapter 22.52.

This standard does not apply as the applicant is not proposing any outside storage.

- b. Parking shall be provided as required by Part 11 of Chapter 22.52. Section 22.52.1060.E. of Part 11 requires that at least two percent of the gross area of the parking lot shall be landscaped.

The applicant's site plan indicates 2 percent of the parking area, 869 square feet, is landscaped.

- c. The site plan depicts a 31,284 square foot building with the uses defined as follows: 2,504 square feet of office space, 14,702 square feet of warehousing, and 14,076 square feet of manufacturing. Section 22.52.1100 of Part 11 requires one automobile space for each 400 square feet of floor area used for offices, one automobile space for each 1,000 square feet of floor area used for warehousing, and one automobile parking space is required for each 500 square feet of floor area used for manufacturing. Pursuant to Section 22.52.1084 of Part 11, loading areas shall be provided as follows: 14,704 square feet of warehousing requires one (1) Type B loading space (30 feet long X 12 feet wide), 14,076 square feet of manufacturing requires (1) Type B loading space.

2,504 square feet of office/400 = 6 spaces required

14,702 square feet of warehousing/1000 = 15 spaces required

14,076 square feet of manufacturing = 28 spaces required

Total spaces required = 49 automobile parking spaces

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, two (2) of these spaces shall be accessible to disabled persons, one (1) of which shall be van-accessible.

The applicant's site plan depicts 58 automobile parking spaces (54 standard spaces, including 4 spaces accessible to disabled persons, one of which is van-accessible), and three (3) Type B loading spaces. The applicant's site plan is in compliance with the parking requirements of the M-1 zone.

- d. Signs shall comply with the requirements of Part 10 of Chapter 22.52.

The applicant has not provided any sign plans with this request.

15. Pursuant to Section 22.40.050 of the County Code, an applicant seeking a conditional use permit to develop property in zone ( )- DP shall submit a proposed development program. Such development program shall consist of the following elements.

- a. A plot plan showing the location of all proposed structures, the alteration or demolition of any existing structures, and development features, including grading, yards, walks, landscaping, height, bulk and arrangement of buildings and structures, signs, the color and appearance of buildings and structures, and other features as needed to make the development attractive, adequately buffered from adjacent more restrictive uses, and in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

The applicant's site plan depicts the proposed development features, except for existing site improvements that will be demolished. The applicant did not submit building elevations.

- b. A progress schedule, which shall include all phases of development and indicate the sequence and time period within which the improvements described will be made.

The applicant did not submit a progress schedule.

16. An Initial Study was prepared for this project and circulated for public review in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the environmental document reporting procedures and guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project.
17. The Superintendent of the San Gabriel Unified School District submitted letters dated January 28, 2003 and May 12, 2003 regarding this request. The subject property is located within 500 feet of Roosevelt Elementary School, within the San Gabriel Unified School District. The Superintendent's concerns include: the traffic the industrial building would bring to the neighborhood, the uncertainty of what would be manufactured at the site, and that a full Environmental Impact Report should be prepared to adequately evaluate how the project will affect the health and safety of the children.
18. One letter in opposition to this request was received from residents who live on Walnut Grove Avenue. The letter states that the industrial use will add to the



current traffic problem on the street and pose noise-related impacts.

**21.**

**BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:**

- A. That the proposed use would not be consistent with the adopted general plan for the area;
- B. That the requested use at the proposed location would adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing in the surrounding area, would be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, and would jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare; and
- C. That the proposed site is not adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate.

AND, THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing does not substantiate the required findings for a Conditional Use Permit as set forth in Section 22.56.090 of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

**REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:**

- 1. In view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-267-(5) is **denied**.

**VOTE: 3-0-0-2**

**Concurring: Commissioners Bellamy, Modugno, Valadex**

**Dissenting: None**

**Abstaining: None**

**Absent: Commissioners Helsley, Rew**

**Action Date: August 20, 2003**

RJF:KMS  
08-20-03

**THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 01-267-(5)**

**WHEREAS**, the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has conducted a public hearing in the matter of Zone Change Case No. 01-267-(5) on May 14, 2003; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Regional Planning Commission finds as follows:

1. The applicant is requesting changes of zone from R-A/R-A-P (Residential – Agriculture/ Residential – Agriculture Parking) to M-1-DP (Light Manufacturing, Development Program) on an approximate 2.19-acre parcel. The Development Program designation would assure that development occurring after rezoning conforms to the approved plans and would ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the conditional use permit would restrict the development of the re-zoned site to the development of a 31,284 square foot industrial building. No other development would be permitted on the property unless a new conditional use permit is first obtained.
2. The subject property is located at 5144 Walnut Grove Avenue, San Gabriel, in the East San Gabriel Zoned District.
3. The zone change request was heard concurrently with Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-267-(5) at a May 14, 2003 public hearing.
4. Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-267-(5) is a related request to develop the 2.19-acre parcel with a 31,284 square foot industrial building to be used for warehousing, light manufacturing and assembly. Since such uses are not permitted in the R-A and R-A-P zones, the requested M-1 zoning is necessary to authorize the proposed project.
5. Surrounding zoning consists of R-A to the north, A-1 (Light Agriculture) to the east, R-1 (Single-Family Residential) to the west, and M-1 (Light Manufacturing) to the south.
6. The prevailing land use pattern in the surrounding area is single-family residential development.
7. The applicant's site plan, marked Exhibit "A", depicts the 2.19-acre subject property developed with a one-story, 31,284 square foot industrial building. Access to the site is via two driveways from Walnut Grove Avenue to the west.
8. The applicant has not substantiated to the satisfaction of the Commission that modified conditions warrant a revision in the zoning code as it pertains to the subject property. No evidence was submitted of any relevant changes in conditions that

have occurred subsequent to the establishment of the R-A and R-A-P zoning on the subject property.

9. The applicant has not substantiated to the satisfaction of the Commission that a need for the proposed zone classification exists within the area in which the subject property is located. No evidence has been submitted of a need for the proposed furniture moving, warehousing and storage uses in the surrounding community.
10. The applicant has not substantiated to the satisfaction of the Commission that the subject property is a proper location for the proposed zoning classification. The requested warehousing, light manufacturing and assembly uses would not be compatible with the surrounding zoning and land uses. The adjacent and prevailing zoning in the vicinity is residential and agricultural, and the prevailing land use is single-family residential development. Industrial uses at the subject location would cause noise, fumes, glare and traffic incompatible with the adjacent single-family residences and the elementary school that is located within 500 feet of the subject property, and the requested zone change would encourage industrial uses to encroach further into residential areas.
11. The applicant has not substantiated to the satisfaction of the Commission that placement of the proposed zone at such location would be in the interest of the public health, safety and general welfare and would be in conformity with good zoning practice. The subject property is included in the inventory maintained by the Department of Regional Planning, General Plan Section, of vacant lands available for building affordable housing. Approval of the requested zone change to M-1-DP and subsequent industrial development would reduce the inventory of property available for housing and contribute to the current housing shortage that exists in unincorporated Los Angeles County.
12. The subject property is located within the Low Density Residential land use classification on the Land Use Policy Map of the County General Plan. This classification depicts areas particularly suitable for single-family detached housing units, including large lot estates and typical suburban tract developments. Densities typically range from one to six units per gross acre. The intent of this classification is to maintain the character of existing low density residential neighborhoods and also to provide additional areas to accommodate future market demand. Further development or expansion of existing local commercial and industrial services is also permitted within the residential land use classifications. Local industrial uses are defined as light industrial uses of a minor nature, as defined by the scale of the facility, number of employees, service area, and general compatibility within the community setting. The proposed industrial use would include a 31,284 square foot building to be used for office space, warehousing and light manufacturing, serve a regional area, and could create noise, fumes, glare and traffic incompatible with the surrounding community. The proposed zone changes from R-A and R-A-P to M-1-DP are not consistent with the goals and objectives of the General Plan.
13. An Initial Study was prepared for this project and circulated for public review in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the

environmental document reporting procedures and guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Regional Planning Commission recommends to the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles as follows:

1. That the proposed changes of zone be denied.
2. That the Board of Supervisors take no further action in accordance with Section 22.16.200 of the Los Angeles County Code unless a request for hearing is timely filed as provided therein.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by a majority of the members of the Regional Planning Commission in the County of Los Angeles on August 20, 2003.

---

Rosie Ruiz, Secretary  
**County of Los Angeles**  
Regional Planning Commission

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

### **PROJECT NUMBER**

**01-267-(5)**

### **CASE NUMBER**

**Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-267-(5)**

### **OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED PROJECT**

The applicant is requesting a change of zone from R-A/R-A-P (Residential – Agriculture/Residential – Agriculture, Parking) to M-1-DP (Light Manufacturing, Development Program) on a 2.19-acre subject property.

The applicant is further requesting a Conditional Use Permit to develop the 2.19-acre parcel with a 31,284 square foot industrial building to be used for warehousing, light manufacturing and assembly. The property owner, Mr. Tom Schiffilea, intends to occupy one-half of the building (15,642 square feet) of the space with his Atlas Van Lines moving and storage business; the other half of the building will be constructed as spec space for lease. The proposed DP (Development Program) designation requires the filing of a Conditional Use Permit.

### **DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY**

**Location**

The subject property is located at 5144 Walnut Grove Avenue, San Gabriel, and in the East San Gabriel Zoned District. The subject property is comprised of five (5) assessors' parcels, parcel numbers 5388-038-039, 040, 041, 042, and 043.

**Physical Features**

The subject property is 2.19-acres, flat, and rectangular shaped. Access to the site is via two (2) driveways from Walnut Grove to the west.

**ENTITLEMENT REQUESTED**

The applicant is requesting a change of zone from R-A/R-A-P (Residential - Agriculture/Residential – Agriculture, Parking) to M-1-DP (Light Manufacturing, Development Program) on a 2.19-acre parcel.

The applicant is further requesting a Conditional Use Permit to develop the 2.19-acre parcel with a 31,284 square foot industrial building with appurtenant parking and landscaping.

**EXISTING ZONING****Subject Property**

Current zoning on the subject property is R-A (Residential - Agriculture, Residential – Agriculture, Parking). The majority of the five (5) parcels comprising the subject property are zoned R-A; assessor's parcel no. 5388-038-042 located on the east side of the subject property, and a portion of assessor's parcel no. 5388-038-043 located on the south side of the subject property are zoned R-A-P.

**Surrounding Properties**

Surrounding zoning consists of R-A to the north, A-1 (Light Agriculture) to the east, R-1 (Single-Family Residential) to the west, and M-1 (Light Manufacturing) to the south.

**EXISTING LAND USES****Subject Property**

The subject property is currently vacant. The northeastern portion of the property has been developed with a parking lot, low block walls separate the paved parking lot from the remainder of the undeveloped property.

**Surrounding Properties**

Surrounding land uses consist of:

North: Five (5) single-family residences abut the projects north property line, additional single-family residences are developed north of those. In addition, Roosevelt Elementary School is located approximately 500 feet north of the subject property.

East: The previous owner of the subject property has retained an approximate 60-foot wide portion of the parcel (approved under Lot Line Adjustment 101,889) that is being used for truck parking associated with the light industrial building

developed directly south of the subject property. On the east side of the parking lot a plant nursery has been developed with the incorporated City of San Gabriel. Southern California Edison transmitting lines run above the nursery. To the east of the nursery, within the unincorporated area of San Gabriel, single-family residences are developed.

South: The previous owner of the subject property has retained an approximate 40-foot wide portion of the parcel (approved under Lot Line Adjustment 101,699) that is being used for truck parking associated with the light industrial building developed directly south of the subject property. Union Pacific Railroad has a rail line running approximately 500-feet south of the subject property. On a site visit Staff noted there is a large industrial building located south of the Rail line that is currently vacant (the building is within the incorporated city of Rosemead).

West: Single-family residences are located west of the subject property.

In addition, a search for major projects pending in the area showed TR53623/OT01-187, located at 5553 Walnut Grove Avenue, San Gabriel, which is located approximately one-half mile north of the subject property. TR53623 is a request for eight (8) detached condominium units.

#### **PREVIOUS CASES/ZONING HISTORY**

There are no previous zoning permit cases noted on the subject property.

#### **LOS ANGELES COUNTYWIDE GENERAL PLAN**

The Land Use Element of the General Plan sets forth countywide policy for the general location and intensity of land use. The Element serves as a tool for coordinating future development and revitalization plans of both the public and private sectors. The policies of the Element support the countywide General Plan policy of encouraging a more concentrated urban pattern through the revitalization of deteriorating urban areas, infilling of bypassed lands and focusing new urban development in the most suitable locations. The Land Use Element calls for a distribution of use intensities within urban areas necessary to carry out this policy. The Land Use Policy map portrays a general pattern and distribution of land uses according to nine generalized classifications. The Land Use Map serves as the policy framework within which more detailed local plans (Areawide, community and neighborhood) as well as development proposals can be considered.

The subject property is classified as Low Density Residential on the Countywide Land Use Policy Map. The map depicts areas particularly suitable for single-family detached housing units, including large lot estates and typical suburban tract developments. Densities typically range from one to six units per gross acre. The intent of this classification is to maintain the character of existing low density residential neighborhoods and also to provide additional areas to accommodate future market demand.

The following goals and policies of the Plan are applicable to the subject property and serve as guidelines for development within the Low Density Residential classification of

the Land Use Map.

- **Quality Neighborhoods**

**Goal:** To maintain and enhance the quality of existing residential neighborhoods.

**Policies:** Encourage development of well designed twinhomes, townhouses and garden apartments, particularly on bypassed parcels within existing urban communities. (Policy No. D.3.)  
Promote neighborhood commercial facilities that provide convenience goods and services and complement community character through appropriate scale, design and locational controls. (Policy No. D.4.)

- **Quality, Compatible Design**

**Goal:** To encourage high quality design in all development projects, compatible with, and sensitive to, the natural and manmade environment.

**Policies:** Protect the character of residential neighborhoods by preventing the intrusion of incompatible uses that would cause environmental degradation such as excessive noise, noxious fumes, glare, shadowing and traffic. (Policy No. D.15.)

Promote planned industrial development in order to avoid land use conflicts with neighboring activities. (Policy No. D.16.)

Based on the above stated goals and policies of the Land Use Plan, Staff has concerns that the proposed industrial use conflicts with the basic policies of the Plan in that the project is regional serving rather than local serving, and the use could create an incompatible use due to noise, fumes, glare and traffic.

## **SITE PLAN**

### **General Description**

The applicant's site plan, marked Exhibit "A", depicts the 2.19 acre subject property developed with a one-story, 31,284 square foot industrial building. Two (2) 12'0" X 14'0" truck loading doors and one (1) truck loading space is shown on the south side of the building. The north side of the building depicts two (2) truck loading doors with two (2) truck loading spaces. 58 parking spaces (54 standard, 4 handicapped) are depicted, dispersed surrounding the building. Rolling gates to secure a portion of the parking lot are depicted on the south and east side of the building. A 20-foot wide landscaped berm is depicted on the north side of the property, six (6) and seven (7) foot landscaped strips are shown on the west side of the building (facing Walnut Grove Avenue), additional landscaping is dispersed throughout the parking lot. Access to the site is via two driveways from Walnut Grove Avenue to the west.

The applicant has not provided any building elevations. If the Commission approves this request, as a condition of approval the applicant will be required to submit scaled building elevations of the proposed industrial building.

### **Compliance with Applicable Zoning Standards**

As the applicant is requesting a change of zone to M-1-DP, the proposed industrial building shall comply with the following required development standards pursuant to Section 22.32. 080 of the County Code as follows:

- Any property used for the outside storage or display of raw materials, equipment or finished products shall comply with the requirements of Part 7 of Chapter 22.52.

Part 7 of Chapter 22.52 requires all outside storage or display open to view from the exterior boundary of the lot or parcel of land upon which it is conducted shall be enclosed by a solid wall or fence as set forth in Part 7, except that the Code exempts certain listed uses from this requirement.

***No outside storage is proposed for this project.***

- Section 22.52.1060.E. of the County Code, at least two percent of the gross area of the parking lot shall be landscaped.

***The applicant's site plan indicates 2 percent of the parking area, 869 square feet, is landscaped.***

- The site plan depicts a 31,284 square foot building with the uses defined as follows: 2,504 square feet of office space, 14,702 square feet of warehousing, and 14,076 square feet of manufacturing. Section 22.52.1100 of the County Code requires one automobile space for each 400 square feet of floor area used for offices, one automobile space for each 1,000 square feet of floor area used for warehousing, and one automobile parking space is required for each 500 square feet of floor area used for manufacturing. Pursuant to Section 22.52.1084 of the County Code, loading areas shall be provided as follows: 14,704 square feet of warehousing requires one (1) Type B loading space (30 feet long X 12 feet wide), 14,076 square feet of manufacturing requires (1) Type B loading space.

***2,504 square feet of office/400 = 6 spaces required***

***14,702 square feet of warehousing/1000 = 15 spaces required***

***14,076 square feet of manufacturing = 28 spaces required***

***Total spaces required = 49 automobile parking spaces***

***Per American with Disabilities Act, two (2) of these spaces shall be handicapped accessible, one (1) of which shall be van handicapped accessible.***

***The applicant's site plan depicts 58 automobile parking spaces (54 standard, 4 handicapped, one of which is handicapped van accessible), and three (3) Type B loading spaces. The applicant's site plan is in compliance with the parking requirements of the M-1 zone.***

- Signs shall comply with the requirements of Part 10 of Chapter 22.52.  
***The applicant has not provided any sign plans with this request. If the Commission approves this request, the applicant will be required to submit sign plans to the Commission and the Director of Planning for approval depicting any proposed signs on the subject property prior to final approval of this request. The signs shall be subject to M-1 zone limitation***



***unless modified by the Commission with this conditional use permit.***

Pursuant to Section 22.40.050 of the County Code, an applicant seeking a conditional use permit to develop property in zone ( )- DP shall submit a proposed development program. Such development program shall consist of the following elements.

- Pursuant to Section 22.40.050.A. of the County Code, the applicant shall submit a plot plan showing the location of all proposed structures, the alteration or demolition of any existing structures, and development features, including grading, yards, walks, landscaping, height, bulk and arrangement of buildings and structures, signs, the color and appearance of buildings and structures, and other features as needed to make the development attractive, adequately buffered from adjacent more restrictive uses, and in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

***The applicant's site plan depicts the proposed development features, except for existing site improvements that will be demolished. The applicant did not submit building elevations. If the Commission approves this request, the applicant will be required to submit a revised site plan showing all development features and building elevations to the Commission and the Director of Planning for approval that depict the architectural style and colors of the building prior to final approval of this request.***

- Pursuant to Section 22.40.050.B. of the County Code, a progress schedule, which shall include all phases of development and indicate the sequence and time period within which the improvements described will be made.

***The applicant has not submitted a progress schedule at the time of this report. Staff recommends that the Commission require the applicant to submit a progress schedule to the Commission and the Director of Planning prior to final action on this request.***

## **BURDENS OF PROOFS**

### **Burden of Proof per Code for Conditional Use Permits**

Pursuant to Los Angeles County Code Section 22.56.040 the applicant must meet the burden of proof requirements for Conditional Use Permits.

1. That the requested use at the location proposed will not:
  - A. Adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, or
  - B. Be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, or
  - C. Jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.
2. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in this Title 22, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area.
3. That the proposed site is adequately served:
  - A. By highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and
  - B. By other public or private service facilities as are required.

### **Applicant's Burden of Proof Responses**

See Attached

#### **Burden of Proof per Code for Zone Change**

Pursuant to Los Angeles County Code Section 22.16.110, the applicant must meet the burden of proof requirements for a zone change.

Modified conditions warrant a revision in the zoning plan as it pertains to the area or district under consideration because:

A need for the proposed zone classification exists within such area or district because:

The particular property under consideration is a proper location for said zone classification within such area of district because:

Placement of the proposed zone at such location will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare, and in conformity with good zoning practice because:

### **Applicant's Burden of Proof Responses**

See Attached

### **ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION**

The Department of Regional Planning has determined that a Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental documentation for this project under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) reporting requirements. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the environmental guidelines and reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

### **COUNTY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

#### **County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works**

The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Transportation Planning and Subdivision Review Section, Land Development Division, has provided comments dated 1-06-03 regarding this request. Their comments are included as an attachment to this report.

#### **County of Los Angeles Fire Department**

The County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Forestry Division, Prevention Bureau, was consulted by Staff during the environmental review phase of this project. Their comments dated April 2, 2002 are included as an attachment to this report.

#### **County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services**

The County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services, Department of Public Health, was consulted by Staff during the environmental review phase of this project. The Department has provided recommended conditions in a letter dated April 4, 2002, their letter has been included as an attachment to this report.

### **OTHER AGENCY COMMENTS**

#### **San Gabriel Unified School District**

Staff is in receipt of a letter from the Superintendent of the San Gabriel Unified School District dated January 28, 2003 regarding this request. The subject property is located

within 500 feet of Roosevelt Elementary School, within the San Gabriel Unified School District. The Superintendent's concerns include: the traffic the industrial building would bring to the neighborhood, the uncertainty of what would be manufactured at the site, and he feels a full Environmental Impact Report should be prepared to adequately evaluate how the project will affect the health and safety of the children. The Superintendent's letter has been included as an attachment to this report.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Staff received one letter in opposition to this request at the time of this report. The letter is from residents who live on Walnut Grove Avenue who are opposed to the request. The residents feel the industrial use will add to the current traffic problem on the street and pose noise-related impacts.

### **STAFF EVALUATION**

#### **Issues**

The applicant anticipates the hours of operation to be from 7:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. Monday through Saturday, with approximately 35 employees working in two (2) shifts.

This conditional use permit request is for the development of an industrial building that includes warehousing, manufacturing, and offices. Section 22.32.040 of the County Code requires the M-1 zone for this use; as such the applicant is requesting the change of zone from R-A/R-A-P to M-1-DP. The Development Program designation requires a conditional use permit be obtained.

Staff has concerns that the requested zone change and proposed development of an industrial building conflicts with the basic policies of the Countywide General Plan. In addition, the adjacent and prevailing zoning in the vicinity is residential and agriculture and the prevailing land use is single-family residential development. Staff has concerns that the requested zone change would be precedent setting for the future, allowing the industrial uses to encroach further into residential areas.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Prior to making a decision on this case, Staff recommends the Regional Planning Commission consider the facts, analysis and correspondence contained in this report along with the oral testimony and/or written comments received during the public hearing.

Staff recommends the Commission also consider the following:

- That the request may not be consistent with the Countywide General Plan with respect to its regional, not local serving character;
- That the request may not be consistent with the Countywide General Plan with respect to creating an incompatible use;
- Whether the burden of proof for the change of zone has been met.

### **Recommendation**

#### **Denial**

If the Planning Commission finds the request does not satisfy the zone change and

conditional use permit burden of proof requirements, then Staff recommends denial of Zone Change and Conditional Use Permit 01-267-(5).

#### **SUGGESTED DENIAL MOTION**

"I MOVE THAT THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AND INDICATE ITS INTENT TO DENY CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 01-267-(5) AND INSTRUCT STAFF TO PREPARE THE APPROPRIATE FINDINGS."

#### **Alternate Recommendation**

##### **Approval**

If the Commission finds the applicant satisfies the zone change and conditional use permit burden of proof requirements for this request, than Staff recommends **Approval** of Zone Change and Conditional Use Permit No. 01-267-(5), subject to the attached draft conditions.

#### **SUGGESTED APPROVAL MOTION**

"I MOVE THE PUBLIC HEARING BE CLOSED AND THAT THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION INDICATE ITS INTENT TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF ZONE CHANGE NO. 01-267-(5), A CHANGE OF ZONE FROM R-A/R-A-P to M-1-DP, AND INDICATE ITS INTENT TO APPROVE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 01-267-(5), AND INSTRUCT STAFF TO PREPARE THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION AND FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL."

Report prepared by Karen Simmons, Senior Regional Planning Assistant  
Reviewed by Russell J. Fricano, Ph.D., AICP, Supervising Regional Planner

RJF:KMS  
01-30-03

#### **STAFF USE ONLY**

PROJECT NUMBER: 01-267

CASES: CUP

ZC



\*\*\*\*\* INITIAL STUDY \*\*\*\*\*

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

## GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: January 9, 2002 Staff Member: Christina D. Tran  
Thomas Guide: 596 G-4 USGS Quad: El Monte  
Location: 5144 Walnut Grove Avenue, San Gabriel

Description of Project: Application for CUP to construct an industrial building totaling 29,880 s.f. The proposed building will be used for warehousing, light manufacturing and assembly (22,410 s.f.) and for an office area (7,470 s.f.). A total of 64 parking spaces will be provided for the proposed development and one transformer and trash enclosure will be located on the north side of the project site. Operating hours will be from 7:00 a.m. to 12 p.m., Mon.- Sat., with a maximum of 56 employees working each of the two shifts. Applicant is also seeking a zone change from R-A and R-A-P to M-1 zone.

Gross Acres: 2.19 acres

Environmental Setting: Project site is a vacant lot located in an urbanized area with no significant animal or plant habitat. Although the site is presently undeveloped, it was previously used for parking. Surrounding uses consist of single family residences, schools, an industrial park, a railroad track, and a high voltage power line and nursery.

Zoning: R-A, R-A-P (Residential Agriculture, Residential Agriculture Parking)

General Plan: Low Density Residential

Community/Area wide Plan: N/A

**Major projects in area:**

<b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION &amp; STATUS</b>
<u>TR53623</u>	<u>8 Condominiums (Pending)</u>
<u>PM20864</u>	<u>3 SF lots (5-10-90 recorded)</u>
<u>PM20069</u>	<u>1 MF / 4 U Condo (8-9-89 recorded)</u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

**REVIEWING AGENCIES**

<p><b>Responsible Agencies</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regional Water Quality Control Board</p> <p>    <input type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles Region</p> <p>    <input type="checkbox"/> Lahontan Region</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Army Corps of Engineers</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><b>Trustee Agencies</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> State Fish and Game</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> State Parks</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p>	<p><b>Special Reviewing Agencies</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> None</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> National Parks</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> National Forest</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Edwards Air Force Base</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>City of Rosemead</u></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>City of San Gabriel</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p>	<p><u>Regional Significance</u></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SCAG Criteria</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns. Area</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><b>County Reviewing Agencies</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision Committee</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DPW: <u>Traffic &amp; Lighting</u></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health Department: <u>Environmental Hygiene</u></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire Department</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p>
--	---	---



IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			<u>Less than Significant Impact/No Impact</u>			
			<u>Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation</u>			
				<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>		
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg				Potential Concern
<u>HAZARDS</u>	1. Geotechnical	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Flood	6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Fire	7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Noise	8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Air Quality	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Biota	11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Education	18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	5. Utilities	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
OTHER	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Land Use	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

## DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS\* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

- Development Policy Map
1. Designation: Conservation/Maintenance
  2. ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
  3. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

**If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.**

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)



Date of  
printout: \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)  
EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

**Environmental Finding:**

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

- ☒ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

- ☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

- ☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT\*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".

- ☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

\*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

## HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size  
DPW

☐ Project Design

☐ Approval of Geotechnical Report by

---



---

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No Impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

## HAZARDS - 2. Flood

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A    ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☐ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES  
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size    ☐ Project Design

---

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

## HAZARDS - 3. Fire

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Industrial park within 500'</i> Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Type of manufacturing is unknown at this time</i> Other factors?

## STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☐ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☐ Fire Prevention Guide No.46

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

*Applicant shall comply with all conditions and recommendations set forth by the Fire Department in their*

*letter dated April 2, 2002*

---

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

## HAZARDS - 4. Noise

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?  <u>Railroad and an industrial park</u>
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?  <u>Schools within 500'</u>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?  <u>Industrial uses</u>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?  <u>Industrial uses</u>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

---

---

---

## STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778      ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES  
CONSIDERATIONS**

☒ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size    ☐ Project Design    ☐ Compatible Use

*Health Department concluded that the proposed project will not have significant impacts in their letter dated*

---

*April 4, 2002. Applicant shall comply with all conditions required by the Health Department in said letter.*

---

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☒ Less than

## RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations <i>or</i> is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?</p> <p><i>Parking lots with more than 25 parking spaces are subject to NPDES requirements</i></p>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?</p> <p><i>Parking lots with more than 25 parking spaces are subject to NPDES requirements</i></p>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste Permit	<input type="checkbox"/> Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
<input type="checkbox"/> Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269 (DPW)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPDES Permit CAS614001 Compliance

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

### ☐ OTHER

### CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size   
 ☐ Project Design   
 ☐ Compatible Use



---

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

## RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

---

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES CONSIDERATIONS

☐

**OTHER**

☐ Project Design    ☐ Air Quality Report

---

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant significant/No impact    ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☒ Less than

### RESOURCES - 3. Biota

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

	<b>Yes</b>	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?

g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES  
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size  
Permit

☐ Project Design

☐ ERB/SEATAC Review

☐ Oak Tree

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

**RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?

b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?

d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?

e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES  
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

## RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <hr/> <hr/>

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES  
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐

**OTHER**

☐ Lot Size      ☐ Project Design

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or

cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

## **RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources**

### **SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <hr/> <hr/>

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES  
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size                      ☐ Project Design

---



---



---



---

### **CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or

cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than



## RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES  
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Lot Size      ☐ Project Design      ☐ Visual Report      ☐ Compatible Use

---

---

---

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

### SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Truck traffic</i> Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES  
CONSIDERATIONS**

☒ **OTHER**

☐ Project Design    ☐ Traffic Report

☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

*DPW concluded that the proposed project will not have any significant impact in their letter dated April 17,*

*2002.*

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

**SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

---

---

---

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

## SERVICES - 3. Education

N/A

## SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create student transportation problems?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

---

---

---

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES  
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Site Dedication    ☐ Government Code Section 65995    ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

---

---

---

---

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☒ Less than

**SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

---

---



---



---

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES  
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ **OTHER**

☐ Fire Mitigation Fee

---



---



---



---



---

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

## SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?

---

d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?

---

e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?

---

f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

---

#### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

#### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES CONSIDERATIONS

☐

**OTHER**

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

---

---

#### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

## OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?



☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

## OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
i.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES  
CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

☐

**OTHER**

---

---

### **CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

### OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
<hr/>				
<i>Zone change requested</i>				
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hillside Management Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project physically divide an established community?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?
<hr/>				
<hr/>				
<hr/>				

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

*Proposed use is allowed under the proposed zone change*

---



---



---

#### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☒ Less than

significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

---

---

---

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or

cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant significant/No impact      ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation      ☒ Less than significant

## MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☐ Potentially significant significant/No impact      ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation      ☒ Less than significant

